



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

25c. a Year

THE NEW YORK

25 Issues

Devoted to The
High-School-College
Entrance
Scholarship Fund

LATIN LEAFLET

Entered at the Post Office in Brooklyn as second-class matter, October 29, 1900

Give Good Ideas
a Chance,
Come Whence
They May

VOL. 1

BROOKLYN, NEW YORK, MARCH 18, 1901

No. 21

The internal purpose of this publication is to provide a Clearing House for secondary classical teachers in New York and vicinity or anywhere else; to afford an opportunity to younger classical scholars anywhere for the publication of their more modest endeavors along the line of original work, which might not otherwise see the light; to stimulate the teaching and quicken the student activity in the classical work in the high schools of Greater New York. The external purpose is to establish one or more College-entrance-scholarships for the most successful graduates from high schools in New York City, to be awarded on a competitive examination. The proceeds over and above expenses will be devoted to a scholarship fund. The labor involved is a labor of love.

TRUSTEES OF THE SCHOLARSHIP FUND

ARTHUR S SOMERS, Central Board of Education

The Ablative with Dignus

Juv. I 73: *aude aliquid brevis Gyaris et carcere dignum, | si vis esse aliquid.* In *Gyaris et carcere* we have of course the well known "Ablative with dignus"; but it is futile to attempt to force upon these words the construction of the Ablative of Specification, which seems to be the favorite category of the grammars. Such a relation is here, at all events, quite inconceivable. However, there is more or less disagreement among the grammarians, and so, a somewhat independent treatment may perhaps be pardoned.

Thus it appears that our school grammars are not only not definite as to the origin of the construction, but disagree in their categorization of it. Madvig and Bennett favor the Ablative of Specification, and perhaps also, Gildersleeve, who nevertheless feels the need of a "special category". Allen and Greenough seem at least independent in their causal classification, while Harkness comes out from behind the accommodating mask of "special construction" into a more specific rôle (1898). This construction well illustrates the futility of grammatical terminology; yet terminology is necessary in assisting tender minds.

Etymology sometimes comes to the rescue where other forces fail. According to Lewis and Short's Latin Dictionary, *dignus* is from Skr. *daç-as*; Gr. *δοκέω, δόξα*; Lat. *decet, decus*. Stolz (Lautlehre pp 29 90) also supports this view. But this derivation has been abandoned in favor of the later and more plausible etymology given in Kühner II 252 15, viz.: "*√ dic, zeigen, Skr. diç-a-mi, zeigen, Gr. δείκ-νν-μι, also eigentlich geezeigt, daher ausgezeig-net und so wuerdig*". Thus, you see, how very easy it is by a little logic to bring the constructions of *dignus* within the fold of the Ablative of Specification. But unfortunately this disposition does not fit all the cases; as for instance in the example given above. Might we not, therefore, by the use of a little more logic, no less palatable than the foregoing, arrive at the Ablative of Price (Value or Measurement) through *dic-nus=aestimatus*?* So, at least says O Keller (See review in Am. J. Ph. IX 251).

* This view of the Ablative with *dignus* as an Ablative of Price was supported in *Latin Notes* (Mch 19 1897) and we were not a little gratified to find afterwards that Professor Moyan (Lane's Latin Gr. [1898] § 1392) had adopted the same category.

This view would not only be sufficiently elastic to fit all the cases, but would fasten its origin to the Instrumental side of the Ablative. Again the rare and poetical Genitive with *dignus* could be called the Genitive of Value and regarded as an analogous construction with the Ablative usage. D H H

More About the Dignus Qui Clause

In No 7 of THE LEAFLET, I said:

The use of the future participle in Silver Latin is so analogous to the development of Purpose and Result Clauses as to attract the attention. The shading of voluntary (personal) purpose into involuntary personal result and finally into impersonal result is quite parallel with the transition of the personal and voluntary future participle of intention into personal and involuntary capability or characteristic and finally into impersonal destiny or fitness. This ought to help Bennett (Appendix 368, 5) in understanding *dignus qui* with the Subjunctive, which he incorrectly records as a Purpose Clause and supports his position by several examples (no references) which so clearly illustrate characteristic, even shading into result, that we need look no further. The use of *dignus* with the Infinitive, which he regards as supporting his classification, is also clearly characteristic and much nearer result than purpose. A particularly good example of characteristic with the Infinitive is the one from Verg. Ecl. 5, 54: *et puer ipse cantari dignus*. The etymology of *dignus* also (whichever view is adopted) as well as its use with the Ablative (whether regarded as Cause, Characteristic or Specification or Price), is in direct line with characteristic. But this is another story.

If I have emphasized anything in the passage quoted, I have emphasized the personal and voluntary character of Purpose as opposed to the impersonal and involuntary character of Result. Whatever criticism is contained in the above of Mr Bennett's views applies, as can be plainly seen, only to his treatment of *dignus qui* clauses, and not to the relative clause in general. Therefore, when he says in No 20 of THE LATIN LEAFLET that another view of the relative clause is that it is a clause of characteristic, and that the only published indorsement of this view with which he is familiar is found in No 7 of THE LEAFLET, I am bewildered, since I do not find this statement in the passage referred to. But, if he means that this is the only published indorsement of the *dignus qui* clause as a clause of characteristic with which he is familiar, then we must conclude that he is unfamiliar with Gildersleeve § 631 1; with Lane §§1818-1819; and with the whole range of recent German authorities, many of whom go so far as to call the construction "konsekutive". We have none of the "epoch-making works" of Professor Hale which inform us as to his views of the *dignus qui* clause, and must therefore content ourselves with such a knowledge of his views as is reflected by his distinguished pupil, until the full light of the sun itself shall break upon us in Mr Hale's Latin Grammar, which we are informed is soon to appear above the horizon. We are forced therefore to the conclusion that THE LEAFLET cannot lay claim to the distinction of containing the only published indorsement of this popular view.

Mr Bennett, however, does enjoy the distinction of being quite alone not only in his view